

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

May 20, 1997

LB 23

criminal abortion is a basis for taking disciplinary action. That's what we're talking about in this area of the law, unprofessional conduct by a physician. If one of these procedures is performed contrary to the law, it's a criminal abortion. There are numerous problems that I see with this bill, and I haven't tried to be mystical with reference to those problems. I have discussed them and pointed them out and explained why I think they are problems. What we are dealing with, in this bill now, is additional language that was lifted from the legislation enacted by Congress, which President Clinton, I hope, will veto. People have accused him of loving women. I think his vetoing that legislation will demonstrate that fact. This bill indicates that a lot of people here hate women, but I don't. This language that is in the law that I want to strike is another one of those attempts to take a particular religious point of view using nonmedical terminology into the statute. I think it clutters and pollutes the law. It is possible to declare what it is these people are trying to do, who support this legislation, without resorting to this kind of language. It wouldn't be used in statutes where we are talking about the governance of banking or commerce, contract, or any other area of the law. We would not misstate scientific fact. Whatever else Senator Tyson may or may not know, he knows that what is in a womb is not a child, and if he thinks that it is, I am sure he wouldn't write that on a zoology examination. And when you study these things, I am talking about reproduction now, of the development from a zygote up to a fetus, all the way to birth, these developmental stages are not referred to as a child because there is not a child here. Words have meaning. It is one thing to teach certain points of view in Sunday school and church. It is another thing to deal in the realm of science and legislation and the law. If you have enough votes, you can put anything into the law, and if you have enough ignorant voters, you can put anything into the constitution, as I have read on various occasions from what's in the Nebraska Constitution, to show that people don't even know what the law is with reference to the qualifications for a member of the U.S. Congress, the House of Representatives, but they put that into the constitution. But that entire complex of nonsense was struck down by the federal court. Fortunately, they don't put the Bible there and say, what do these right-wingers want in the law? No, the constitution says certain things, and when this